Please amend claim 25 as follows:

Sub C6

25. (Once amended) A method for identifying a modulator of the binding of CCX CKR to a chemokine comprising

(a) contacting an isolated or recombinant CCX CKR polypeptide and the chemokine in the presence of a test compound, and

B1

(b) comparing the level of binding of the chemokine and the polypeptide in (a) with the level of binding in the absence of the test compound, wherein

the chemokine is selected from the group consisting of ELC, SLC, TECK, BLC, CTACK, mMIP-1γ and vMIPII, and

a decrease in binding indicates that the test compound is an inhibitor of binding and an increase in binding indicates that the test compound is an enhancer of binding.

Please amend claim 32 as follows:

B2

32. (Once amended) A process for providing a pharmaceutical composition, comprising effecting the steps of a method of claim 29 and thereafter formulating a modulator of CCX CKR activity for pharmaceutical use.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants elect with traverse to prosecute the claims of Group VII, claims 25-27.

The election is made with traverse for several reasons. First, Applicants submit that all the current claims in Groups VII-X should be examined together, because the claims in each of these groups include claims derived from the same concept and theory and thus are related. That the claims are related is evidenced by the fact that all the claims in Groups VII-X are drawn to methods of identifying a modulator of CCX CKR activity (claims 25 and 27, and claims 29-31), or to methods of formulating a modulator identified by such methods as a pharmaceutical composition. The relatedness of these claims is further evidenced by the fact that all the claims in these four groups have been classified to the same class and, in most instances, even to the same subclass. Additionally, the similarity in issues and steps involved in the claims in these four groups means that a search for art in one group will be substantially the same as a

search for art in the other groups. This is particularly evident with respect to claims 28 (Group VIII) and 32 (Group X) which are drawn to methods for providing a pharmaceutical composition which involve all the same steps as claims 25 (Group VII) and 29 (Group IX), respectively. Thus, in view of the similarity in subject matter in Groups VII -X and the fact that a search for art in one of these groups will largely be coextensive with search for art in another one of these groups, it is submitted that it would not be an undue burden on the Office to examine the claims in each of these four groups and it is requested that the Patent Office examine the claims within these groups.

If, despite the foregoing arguments, the Office will not examine the claims of Groups VII-X together, Applicants respectfully request that the Office at least examine the claims within Groups VII and VIII together. As noted above, claim 28, the sole claim in group VIII, involves all the same steps as the method of base claim 25 in Group VII. Thus, in examining the claims in Group VII, the Office will necessarily examine methods such as those defined according to claim 28. Consequently, there will be no additional burden on the Office in examining claim 28 from Group VIII. Accordingly, it is requested that the Office at least examine the claims in Groups VII and VIII together.

RESPONSE TO SPECIES ELECTION

If, as here, Group VII claims are elected, the Office further requires an election of species from the list of chemokines listed in claim 25 as amended (previously claim 26). Applicants traverse this requirement and respectfully request reconsideration thereof.

In accordance with MPEP §803.02, the Office cannot require an election of a single species prior to examination on the merits if the members of a Markush-type claim, such as claim 25, are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, even if the members are directed to independent and distinct inventions (emphasis added). There are only 7 disclosed species in claim 25, and these species are closely related in that they all are chemokines. It is therefore respectfully submitted that examination of claim 25 in its entirety can be made without undue burden.